

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 171 608

SO 011 680

AUTHOR Schubert, William H.
TITLE Frames of Curriculum Knowledge Production: Historical Review and Recommendations.
PUB DATE [Apr 79]
NOTE 34p.; Paper presented to the Annual Conference of the American Educational Research Association (San Francisco, California, April 1979)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Bibliographies; *Curriculum Development; *Curriculum Evaluation; *Curriculum Research; Educational Attitudes; *Educational History; Educational Objectives; Educational Philosophy; Educational Resources; Educational Theories; Educational Trends; Graduate Professors; Higher Education; Relevance (Education); *Teacher Education Curriculum; *Teacher Educators

ABSTRACT

This paper offers a brief history of the development of curriculum knowledge as shown in 20th century publications. Observations about curriculum development are noted and recommendations are made for further exploration. Books and their authors are reviewed from the turn of the century to the present, beginning with theory predominance and the emerging schools of intellectual traditionalism, social behaviorism, and experientialism in the 1900s. Analytical interpretations dominated the twenties, school-oriented texts the thirties. In the forties, readings and synoptic texts appeared, and the sixties emphasized structure of disciplines and curriculum projects. Reconceptualists brought a revival of philosophic scrutiny and speculation in the seventies. The curriculum began as an inheritor of the three philosophies, grew as it created and outlined a future course of inquiry and developed into a purveyor of schooling. It then became preoccupied with the determination of substance and professed and generated knowledge about that. Now it is seeking freedom from the boundaries of that knowledge by returning to philosophy. Recommendations for the future include a need to search for the roots of curriculum study, and emulate these origins by perceiving curriculum as a function of culture. Curriculum inquiry should also be applied to outside curricula (other forces that influence the child's view of the world) and a knowledge of the student himself. (CK)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED171608

FRAMES OF CURRICULUM KNOWLEDGE PRODUCTION:
HISTORICAL REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATIONS

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

William H. Schubert

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

William H. Schubert
University of Illinois
at Chicago Circle

A paper presented to the Annual Conference of the American Educational Research Association (April, 1979) in San Francisco as a contribution to a Division B Symposium entitled "Occupational Characteristics of the Curriculum Professoriat: Historical Perspectives" organized by Steven Hazlett of the University of Texas at Austin.

SESSION 16.26

A professoriat should be known, at least in large part, by the record of what it professes. This is the perspective from which I have decided to look at the curriculum professoriat; through the books produced by curriculum professors. This paper is based on a larger study which I have pursued for some time. While I do not intend to dwell on that project, it is worth noting because my comments stem from it.

During the past four years I have accumulated a bibliography of curriculum books that I believe to be quite comprehensive. Some of you are aware of this work through various papers and presentations.¹ Recently, the work was augmented considerably. . . It now contains nearly 1200 citations around which I have completed the draft of a book. The book, like the bibliography is arranged in chapters that parallel the first eight decades of the Twentieth Century. The first part of each chapter provides highlights of social, political, intellectual, artistic, scientific, and technological developments. The second part consists of commentary about major contributions to curriculum literature and thought. Another related study that I have pursued is a study of the historical "roots", to use a much publicized metaphor, of curriculum. A major part of that study was done with George Posner of Cornell University, and is a subject of another presentation at this conference as well as the Second Annual Meeting of the Society for the Study of Curriculum History that met in San Francisco on April 8, 1979.² The thrust of that study is to locate interconnections among scholars who influenced curriculum. It is hoped that both studies will help clarify thought and action that has spurred curriculum developments in the past, and that it thereby will help give direction to the future of curriculum endeavor.

Neither work is history in a technical sense, but they are historical. Thus, I can safely say that I have engaged in activities related to the title of this paper, a title that now seems to emerge from a hazy past. To claim, as the title might be interpreted, that in this paper I presume to provide the frames of curriculum knowledge is indeed presumptuous. The claim, instead, is to provide some pictures of the curriculum professoriat through the frames of curriculum books, and through the interdependence among scholars who produced them. Through my surveys of curriculum books that led to the studies described above, I had opportunity to image the books in varieties of groupings and from differing distances. I became convinced that one important way to view curriculum knowledge is through its presentation in books. Books themselves constitute a frame for curriculum knowledge, as do the several styles of books that evolved from 1900 to present. It seems to follow that curriculum professors can be characterized by the knowledge that they profess. Their books are a record of their "professions". Their "professions" characterize their profession or occupation. The substance and form of their books, the subjects treated and the way that they are treated, constitute a repertoire of data for characterizing their work. These data help to identify boundaries that the curriculum professoriat deems relevant to curriculum study.

Admittedly, the study of curriculum books and the interdependence of scholars are but two among many vantage points to be explored if a meaningful portrayal of the curriculum professoriat is to emerge. Yet such exploration, in my estimation, offers much potential.

To this end the paper is divided into three sections. The first is a brief profile of salient developments in curriculum books and authors in each decade of the Twentieth Century. The second consists of several observations and possibilities that accumulated as I pursued the work. In the third section I recommend areas for increased attention by curriculum professors. This three-fold treatment is bound to be a bit disjointed and sketchy in a paper of this size. My decision to provide this kind of paper is provoked by a desire to open an array of considerations for exchange. I believe that this suits the purposes of a symposium at least as well as treatment of one or two points in greater detail.

Profile

Each decade brought both new form and substance to curriculum. Many of the highlights are familiar. The date 1918 seems to be the most frequently acknowledged starting point for curriculum as an area of study. It is the date of both Bobbitt's The curriculum and the Cardinal principles of secondary education. This was indeed a time of emergence for curriculum as an area of study that became differentiated within the field of education. Yet, it is a bit unfair to begin at 1918. Direct roots of the curriculum professoriat should be traced to earlier times. Therefore, let me tread backward from 1918, past at least twenty curriculum books to the final years of the previous century.

In these years we find a combination of events that included the ever-rising tide of universal schooling, the recent pronouncements of the Committees of Ten and Fifteen, and the existence of several fertile coteries of scholarship. Universal schooling heightened the necessity

for experts whose sole attention could be devoted to the production of defensible substance for children and youth who were recipients of that schooling. The Committees of Ten and Fifteen influenced universal schooling to continue the perpetuation of mental disciplines or intellectual traditions, a subject-oriented curriculum that carried more than remnants of faculty psychology. For the sake of categorization I shall call proponents of this view intellectual traditionalists.

It seems that certain influential professors at certain American universities grew uneasy about the future of curriculum in the American experiment of universal schooling. These professors cannot be called curriculum professors in a formal way since curriculum had not developed as a professional area of study. Yet these professors shared a concern for the form and substance of education. Students whom they influenced became founders of curriculum study. They originated the curriculum professoriat. Let us look at a few of the coteries of professors and students that were, perhaps unwittingly, carving out occupational characteristics of the curriculum professoriat near the turn of the century. Let us look, too, at the kinds of books that they produced. Both scholars and their books fall roughly into two camps. The two camps have many variations, but they both offer alternatives to the intellectual traditionalist domination of educational practice. One is oriented to quantitative measurement, behavioristic psychology, and a Hobbesian faith in the science of education. For the convenience of labeling, let us call them social behaviorists. The other group has its roots in philosophy, and is oriented toward a situational and contextual interaction

of art and science as it applies to education. I call this group experientialists.

The origins of the social behaviorist position trace to Wilhelm Wundt at Leipzig, Germany. E.L. Thorndike's mentor, J. McKeen Cattell, studied with Wundt as did G. Stanley Hall and Charles H. Judd. Although Thorndike, Hall, and Judd were not primarily curriculum scholars, their leadership created such scholars. Hall influenced Bobbitt who received his doctorate in 1909 from Clark University. From there Bobbitt went to the University of Chicago where Judd had just assumed leadership, altering the orientation considerably from the time that Dewey was in command there. George D. Strayer completed his doctorate under Thorndike's direction in 1905. Strayer influenced students at Columbia Teachers College for nearly forty years. Hollis Caswell and Paul Hanna were among his prominent students whose influence on the curriculum professoriat is unquestioned. They, in turn, influenced many who moved throughout the country.

Experientialist roots can be traced to John Dewey and Charles De Garmo. At the turn of the century, when Dewey was at Chicago, Ella Flagg Young and W. W. Charters studied there. Later at Columbia, Kilpatrick not only studied with Dewey but became a kind of self-appointed interpreter of Dewey's educational views. De Garmo, who studied with K.V. Stoy in Germany, brought Herbartian interpretations to America as did Frank and Charles McMurry. Boyd H. Bode and William Bagley received doctorates in 1900 at Cornell University where De Garmo was Professor of Art and Science of Education. They studied with Edward Titchener and Charles Tyler, respectively. Books such as Dewey's The child and the curriculum (1902) and McMurry's two volume Course of study in the eight grades (1906)

illustrate the experientialist commitments to child study, primacy of interest in curricular organization, and an interdependence between living and schooling in the educative process.

Books by Bagley, Strayer, Judd, and others often focused on school surveys. This focus helped to gear the emergent area of curriculum study toward schools. This was the case with the mental discipline approach as well, which was furthered by the work of national committees that were mentioned earlier, and perpetuated by the Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education (1918). Despite Dewey's holistic treatment of curriculum matters in Democracy and education (1916) and despite its widespread citation in curriculum books, curriculum writers increasingly geared their writing to schools.

By the mid-1920's the "descendants" of Thorndike and Judd, of Dewey and Herbart, and of the commissions each formed fairly distinct groupings of curriculum scholars, i.e., social behaviorists, experientialists, and intellectual traditionalists. Curriculum was indeed an identifiable subdivision of educational inquiry. Bobbitt (1915, 1918, 1922, 1924, 1926), Charters (1923), and Snedden (1921, 1927), led the social behaviorists. Dewey (1900, 1902, 1913, 1916), Kilpatrick (1918, 1926), Counts (1926), McMurry (1923), and Rugg (1927), led the experientialists. Professors in both groups tried to apply interpretations of science to curriculum construction, a process that some deemed riddled by unsystematic selection governed by expedience, tradition, and politics. Social behaviorists used a mechanistic, atomistic, measurement style of science. They analyzed activities, translated the findings to curriculum, and sought generalized knowledge. On the contrary, experientialists sought a

situational application of science. The educator's job was to read the the character of problematic circumstances, project possible courses of action and their probable consequences, and act in such ways that led to growth. Though vague in many respects, professors who wrote in this persuasion tried to describe a complex application of scientific methodology that accounted for uniquenesses in situations as well as commonalities among them. Even the more practice-oriented books in this group such as Rugg and Shoemaker (1928) tended to be philosophical.

Another kind of curriculum book out-numbered both of these in the Twenties and early Thirties. This was the highly school-oriented text, that focused on curriculum in the secondary, elementary, junior high school, etc. Examples include Koos (1920) and Bonser (1920). Others of a similar type dealt with general curriculum procedures and problems, e.g., Meriam (1920), Monroe (1925), Briggs (1926), Harap (1928), Williams (1928), Hopkins (1929), and Lide (1933). Thus, the alternative to social behaviorist and experientialist thought was not so much the old version of intellectual tradition, but a new school-oriented orientation. The point was to provide guidelines, often called "principles", for school people. The curriculum professoriat was grappling with the issue of how to present knowledge about a complex process in one book. Practitioners would be likely to have only one or two courses in curriculum. Somehow the necessary procedures needed to be conveyed in that scope. In a 1931 issue of the Review of Educational Research, L. Thomas Hopkins recognized the need and said that Harap (1928) was first to address it carefully:

All books written up to 1928 were too long on theory and too short on its application in practice. Harap made the first real attempt to bridge this gap. He combines theory and practice into a series of steps to be followed by the curriculum maker... (p.5).

By the mid-1930's many members of the professoriat had apparently internalized the guideline approach. Texts contained list after list of 'how to's', 'what to's', and 'when to's'. Many continued with this recipe-orientation even into the Fifties and Sixties. This was the case despite admonitions by such writers as Bode (1927), Rugg (1927), and Hopkins (1925) to engage in serious discourse about assumptions that undergird alternative positions on major curriculum questions. The schools of curriculum thought became less distinct, more conflated with one another. At the same time curriculum study began to embrace more areas: organization, administration, students, teachers, learning theory. In a sense, curriculum had returned to its state before it differentiated from education. That is to say, curriculum study expanded to treat almost as many aspects of schooling as did the study of education itself. This expansion of boundaries relative to schooling and the amalgamation of schools of thought was reflected in the books of "principles" for practitioners. To this end a new kind of text was produced that was encyclopedic or synoptic in character. It attempted to provide procedures for curriculum development as well distillations of background information on a host of related topics. First examples of these texts were Curriculum

development (1935) by Caswell and Campbell and Foundations of curriculum building (1936) by Norton and Norton. This synoptic style of text continued to dominate curriculum writing for more than three decades. It is interesting to note that each text seemed to be designed as a "one shot" professional training course in curriculum. Each tried to cover, or sample, the territory. That there is little gradation in level of these texts supports the assumption that one exposure to curriculum was expected. Examples include Spears (1940), Gwynn (1943), Burton (1944), Leonard (1946), Stratemeyer (1947), Ty'er (1949), Krug (1950), Lee and Lee (1950), Smith, Stanley, and Shores (1950), Ragan (1953), Saylor and Alexander (1954), and Taba (1962).

Caswell and Campbell also produced another kind of curriculum book, Readings in curriculum development (1937). From then to the present, books of readings have been used as a major means of conveying curriculum knowledge. Usually they included articles that had already achieved prominence in journals. Sometimes they included new articles that were especially prepared for their publications.

Synoptic texts and books of readings were the major type of curriculum books from the Forties through the Sixties. Added to these were monographs and yearbooks of such organizations as the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development and the National Society for the Study of Education.

In the Sixties the huge emphasis on structure of disciplines and curriculum projects accompanied the synoptic and readings texts of the time. Alternative curricula of humanistic education emerged; this was reminiscent of the earlier experientialists. Behavioral objectives, competency-based

curriculum, systems rhetoric, and technological approaches seemed to be a resurgence of social behaviorism. A major alteration that reached fruition in the Sixties was the increased use of social science and behavioristic methodologies that are labeled conceptual-empiricist by Pinar (1978). This is the "theoretic" research mode that Schwab (1970) called "moribund".

The Seventies brought increased diversification of types of curriculum books and a resultant decline in synoptic texts. More attention also was given in America to British, German, Scandinavian, Australian, and Canadian sources. Reconceptualists emerged in the mid-Seventies bringing a revival of philosophic scrutiny and speculation that once characterized a style of study led by Dewey and the Herbartians. Yet, the literature, especially the journals, was dominated by conceptual analysis and empirical studies. The sophistication of conceptual and statistical analysis soared. To some this represented progress or at least its potential. To others it symbolized slavery to one epistemological orientation and ignorance that others existed.

The Sixties and Seventies are quite familiar, so less time will be devoted to them here. Analysis of the present is admittedly necessary, but it is difficult to view it with the kind of distance that enhances historical analysis. Therefore, I will concentrate primarily on possible implications of developments in the earlier years of the curriculum professoriat and the kinds of books it produced. This is in keeping with this symposium's stated emphasis on historical perspectives.

Characteristics of the Curriculum Professoriat:

Some Observations and Possibilities

My surveys of curriculum books and their authors have led to several observations about occupational characteristics of the curriculum professoriat. The characteristics are presented here both chronologically and cumulatively, according to the following observations: (1) the curriculum professoriat evolved as an inheritor, (2) it created and delimited a future course of inquiry; (3) it grew as a purveyor of schooling; (4) its preoccupation was with the determination of the substance of school learning; (5) it professed knowledge; (6) it generated knowledge; and (7) it sought freedom from the boundary of that knowledge. Let us consider each of these in a bit more detail.

Inheritors of a Journey

Probing the roots of curriculum quickly reveals that concern for curriculum is perennial. The etymological origins of curriculum as a race course can be applied metaphorically to the journey of inducting young into society. The basic human concern for induction of new members into adult oriented society marks a basis of legitimation for curriculum as a professional domain. The concern is supported in several modes of representation.

To trace roots of prominent curriculum scholars to educators of the late Nineteenth Century is only a beginning. For example, a chain exists from Shirley Engle, to B. O. Smith, to Harold Rugg, to William Bagley, to association with Charles De Garmo, who can be traced to K. F. Stoy, to Herbart. Herbart, in turn, can be traced in a mentor-student network to Pestalozzi and Fichte, Lessing, Kant, Martin Knutzen, Christian Wolff, Leibniz, and more indirectly to Descartes and to Rousseau, and to the

French Jesuits. All of these wrote covertly, if not overtly, about education, and concomitantly about curriculum.

They represent a concern shared by philosophers to antiquity. Philosophical grand schemes almost invariably treat problems associated with introducing young to the structure, resources, and functioning of social groups. Whether they be proposals or social criticisms, these writings deal not only with curriculum in a formal educational setting, but with education as one of many aspects in any context of social forces. The treatment of curriculum within such a context is part of a tradition of social philosophical writing.

Similarly, one can surely turn to novels, poetry, plays, biographies, diaries, and other literary portrayals for curriculum insights. They illuminate journeys that educate persons. They portray experiences that enhance and retard human growth. They deal with growth holistically, not in cognitive, affective, or psychomotor segmentations. The point, perhaps an obvious one, is that a heritage of curriculum literature runs deeper than the overt occupational characteristics of the curriculum professoriat. It interpenetrates literature from Homer to Plutarch, to Shakespeare, to Dickens, to Tolstoy, to Dostoyevski and Joyce, Hesse and Kafka, Vonnegut and Borges. Moreover, curriculum has permeated human concern since young humans were thought to need induction to a society. Whether such induction pertained to schooling institutions or whether it pertained to a child following an adult through daily routine, curriculum was being done.

Thus, those who emerged to be known as a curriculum professoriat early in the Twentieth Century were inheritors of a basic human concern.

The informal provision of activities to induct the young into adult oriented life is a perennial parental concern. With the growth of complex social groups it became more formalized in school institutions. The substance of education and schooling was represented in the arts, discussed by philosophy, and criticized in both. In all of these it was integrated with and contingent upon living itself. Education was treated part as part parcel of the journey of living. The emergence of the educational professoriat brought more specialized study. Still more specialization, and an accompanying separation from life as a whole, evolved with the emergence of the curriculum professoriat as an occupation.

Delimiters of the Journey

The specialization implicit in a curriculum professoriat magnified focus on a concern that had been subsidiary. What had been a concern for induction of the young into adult-oriented living, a concern expressed within broad cultural, artistic, and intellectual contexts, became a preoccupation with schooling as the means of induction that pushed contextual concerns into the periphery. Books on curriculum, especially the synoptic texts, almost invariably treated the larger contextual forces as mere influences on curriculum, rather than curriculum as one thread in a fabric of forces that influence the induction of young into adult life. Specialization was, in no small measure, dictated by increased pressure for universal schooling. Specialized inquiry into curriculum was legitimated so long as it appeared to contribute to learning substance to be conveyed by universal schooling. It is ironic that the curriculum professoriat, a group commissioned to prepare the young to effectively

engage in life as a whole, is the same group that turned its attention from induction as a function of life holistically to schooling. Put another way, the historical journey of those concerned with inducting the young into life was, in this century, placed in the hands of curriculum specialists commissioned to introduce the young to effective living via institutions known as schools.

Purveyors of Schooling

The curriculum professoriat emerged in response to universal schooling. In short, if the form was there it needed substance. If the conveyor belts were set in motion something had to be conveyed. It seemed clear that it would be the quasi-classical subject matter that dominated schooling unless alternatives were offered. If nothing definite was available to convey, caprice would dictate substance. If caprice governed, the message would be the medium itself. Universal schooling would convey the universal need to be schooled. Would this perpetuate a land of students, persons who would be prepared not to be directors of their own curriculum, but to have the curriculum of their learning directed by others? Would the curriculum of schooling become schooling itself?

At the turn of the century there were too few educators who could devote full-time consideration to learning substance for universal schooling. Some educational scholars centered their concern on the substance of education generally, though often as it applied to private schooling or informal learning experiences rather than mass schooling. As mentioned earlier, alternatives to intellectual traditionalist interpretations were found in the theory and practice of Herbartians and Dewey, and by the measurement and behaviorism of Thorndike, Judd, and Cattell. Both alternatives were fueled by public sentiments; i.e., social behaviorists by the growing faith

in science and technology, and experientialists by faith in individualism and democracy.

It is clear that the curriculum professoriat was legitimated by the need for learning substance for universal schooling. Educational scholars (e.g., De Garmo, Dewey, Hall, Judd, and Thorndike) offered alternative orientations to the intellectual traditionalist curriculum that dominated schooling. Perhaps they saw it as a socially significant venture to do so.

Developers of Curriculum

It was a kind of occupational commission that the curriculum professoriat develop curriculum. What else could be the purpose of curriculum inquiry than to discover curricula? Curriculum scholars did, on occasion, develop curriculum; they prepared curriculum materials, proposed examples of programs, and evaluated extant curriculum implementation. It seems, however, that curricularists soon realized that general programs could not be formulated to meet specific needs of unique situations. Therefore, their discussion elevated to a meta-level and addressed the issue of how instead of what. They decentralized the decision about what learning substance should constitute curriculum of schools. They attempted to provide "principles" to guide curriculum planners in schools. The curriculum professoriat became known largely as scholars who were concerned with problems and procedures of curriculum development.

Professors of Curriculum Knowledge

Service to schools was an initial concern of the curriculum professoriat. The widespread existence of normal schools for teacher training set a precedent for service to schools. As certain prominent philosophers, psychologists, and educators turned their attention and that of their

students to curriculum matters, curriculum became associated with universities as well.

The role of curriculum workers was altered by virtue or vice of the professoriat's emergent residence in universities. That faction of curriculum workers known as professors had much of their role directed by the system of rewards and expectations that is incumbent upon university faculty members. A professoriat professes by publication as well as by consulting and teaching. Books became a major symbol of legitimation. Books facilitated teaching and consulting, but even more they provided evidence of scholarly productivity.

As professors of knowledge, curriculum professors began by publishing an amalgam of prescriptions and descriptions drawn from teaching teachers with eclectically selected positions from several orientations: social behaviorist, experientialist, and intellectual traditionalist.

Generally, a lag persisted between curriculum and more established areas or disciplines of study. The lag in both methodology and substance was blatantly evident. Methodologically, curricularists like other educational researchers, emulated social scientists who, in turn, emulated successes of of natural sciences. When natural scientists moved from heavy reliance on statistics to formulation of theory, social scientists gave prime concern to statistics and education upgraded statistics requirements for its students. When natural scientists moved from theory to situational analysis, social scientists began to develop theories, and curricularists expressed a need (Herrick and Tyler, 1950) for theory and speculated about what it might entail. Substantively, the case is similar. Existential psychology and philosophy was made central by Sartre, Camus, Jaspers, Heidegger, Kafka,

and others by the 1920's and 1930's. Yet, it was not until the 1970's that reconceptualists brought existential perspectives to curriculum, though Pritzkau (1959) provided such emphasis earlier.

A point similar to that asked by Harry S. Broudy (1979) is highly relevant. Broudy asked, "What do professors of education profess?" The academic community at large has, justifiably or not, asked similar questions of educators perennially. The same was true for those who claimed to be curriculum scholars. Moreover, they asked themselves the questions as well. It was clearer that the curriculum professoriat had to profess to live.

Generators of Knowledge

If the job of curriculum professors was to profess knowledge, it was necessary for them to create a steady flow of it. Furthermore, this knowledge had to conform to that deemed acceptable in academia. It had to conform to the epistemology of the day, at least of a nearby yesterday.

The problem of what kind of knowledge should be produced plagued the field. As creators of scholarly research, the curriculum professoriat had to produce empirically warranted descriptions of school phenomena. As a professional area of study, it needed to prescribe services to practitioners in schools. Throughout its eighty year history the curriculum professoriat has come under fire for doing too much and too little of both. Generally, it has been strong on prescription and weak in description. Authors produced books that reflected this proportion, but by simultaneously attempting to satisfy demands of scholarly description and practical prescription, they provided books that were amalgams of both. As a consequence the books were criticized by scholars for being superficial and by practitioners for not relating to specific practical concerns.

Despite the criticisms, books were a source of legitimation and their production grew steadily as the decades progressed. In the first decade of the Twentieth Century twelve books were produced. The remainder were as follows:

1910-19	11
1920-29	82
1930-39	108
1940-49	77
1950-59	119
1960-69	290
1970-79	353

(Schubert, 1979)

The proliferation of books was indeed great. The growth of the field might be compared, at the expense of metaphoric triteness, to a train that began with a few cars, the first designating that curriculum was important enough to be treated as an educational subdivision deserving attention in its own right. At first, they no doubt relied on traditions embodied in the mental disciplines position that empowered the existence of curriculum workers. Hence, a number of books emerged in the first three decades that quite wholly reflected the intellectual traditionalist orientation. Others relied more on their immediate scholarly ancestors in education and related areas: Thorndike, Strayer, Wundt, Herbart, De Garmo, Dewey, Peirce, James, etc. These scholars were not curricularists, though they markedly influenced the existence of social behaviorist and experientialists curriculum thought.

As the decades progressed the train took on new cars. At first these segments included elementary, secondary, and junior high levels of

education. Some treated the subject areas separately. Others advocated processes or procedures for developing curricula. Still others treated curriculum administration, implementation, materials, and a host of miscellaneous ideas often called "problems" or "issues." Some books provided data, usually of the informal case study or survey variety. A few probed for assumptions behind these prescriptions and descriptions. Another few suggested implications for teaching that might be drawn from prescriptions and descriptions. By 1940 the curriculum train had sufficient cars of differing shapes and styles that it was growing impossible for anyone but a full time curriculum scholar to grasp the field's written knowledge. This was the knowledge that was used to prepare administrators, supervisors, and teachers, not just other scholars. Most administrators, supervisors, and teachers would only take one or two curriculum courses. Thus, synoptic texts were created to provide one-shot orientations, i.e., everything practitioners needed to know about curriculum.

By the Sixties such literature was criticized ferociously as arm-chair speculation. Even though much was derived from direct involvement in schools, it was not derived in ways deemed defensible by epistemologies that had come to dominate educational inquiry. Defensible knowledge needed to take the form of conceptual analysis sanctioned by analytic philosophers, and/or empirical studies sanctioned by social scientists and psychologists. A plethora of studies from both vantage points dominated curriculum writing from then until the present.

A Clamor for Freedom

Finally, the Seventies brought a castigation of the powers that dominated curriculum inquiry. Schwab's (1970) critique of the Theoretic research paradigm is well known. Apple, Huebner, Mann, Macdonald, Pinar, Willis, and others (Pinar 1975) who are often referred to as reconceptualists call today for inquiry that embraces the phenomenological, existential, literary, psychoanalytical, and other sources. They clamor for freedom from the chains of domination by one epistemology. The criticism pertains to both curriculum inquiry and to the substance of school curriculum and its relation to living outside of classrooms.

Recommendations

The purpose of studying curriculum history should be to provide insight that guides the curricular present and future. Knowledge about occupational characteristics of the curriculum professoriat in the past should spur thoughts about directions that the curriculum professoriat might take. Therefore, I will now share five recommendations, though they are rudimentary, that I offer them to the attention of the curriculum professoriat.

The Search for Origins

The search for origins of the curriculum professoriat has begun. As it currently stands, it provides a step toward preventing ahistoricism. It primarily provides initial fragments of knowledge about the curriculum professoriat vis-a-vis schools and universities. The origins, however, run much deeper. The roots of curriculum study are portrayed in history, philosophy, and the arts to antiquity. Their archetypes can be traced to ordinary family life, social evolution, and the arts of high culture.

Together, these illuminate perennial concern for substance in the journey of children and youth as they are inducted into the culture perpetuated by adults. Literacy, artistic, historical, and philosophical sources interpret, evaluate, and criticize that journey. They sometimes propose its reform. It is imperative that those who wish to study curriculum today learn of the saga of human concern which, in part, gave birth to curriculum as a specialized area of study in our world of specialization.

The Emulation of Origins

The search for roots in many fields today discredits the long held notion that the growth of knowledge always ferrets out inert ideas and preserves productive ones. Even the natural sciences are reviving documents previously believed to be archaic. Viewed with new perspectives, such documents often reveal method and substance that illuminate current problems. Curricularists have experienced this, too. Some have begun to realize that while increased curriculum specialization magnified schooling, it clouded a holistic vision of childhood's curriculum to adulthood. Such a vision is portrayed in novels, poetry, film, painting, and music. It is analyzed in psychology, philosophy, anthropology, and history. These and other sources reflect an array of epistemological bases: intuition, empiricism, experience, revelation, reason, authority, utility, and so on. The science of behaviorism does not monopolize the route to curricular wisdom. The richness of perspectives that brought curricular insight before specialization arrived needs to be revitalized. The variety of methodologies in such perspectives should not be ignored.

Speculative endeavor, though today demised, ignited contributions made by recent ancestors of the curriculum professoriat. Fodor describes it well in reference to psychology, noting ancestors common to those of the curriculum professoriat.

There used to be a discipline called speculative psychology. It wasn't quite philosophy because it was concerned with empirical theory construction. It wasn't quite psychology because it wasn't an experimental science. But it used the methods of both philosophy and psychology because it was dedicated to the notion that scientific theories should be both conceptually disciplined and empirically constrained. What speculative psychologists did was this: They thought about such data as were available about mental processes, and they thought about such first-order psychological theories as had been proposed to account for the data. They then tried to elucidate the general conception of the mind that was implicit in the data and the theories. Speculative psychology was, by and large, quite a good thing: William James and John Dewey were speculative psychologists and so, in certain of his moods was Clark Hull. But it's commonly said that there aren't any speculative psychologists any more. (Fodor, 1975, p. vii)

I suggest that the curriculum professoriat repel pressures to expunge its tendency to engage in speculation. It needs to resist the force to increase specialization which limits attention to schooling alone. I suggest that curriculum scholars advance the emergent tendency to perceive curriculum broadly, as a function of culture not merely of schooling. Prerequisite to doing this, at least in the process of doing so, the curriculum professoriat needs to expose the limits and impositions of the epistemological assumptions that undergird the several social and behavioral sciences that direct the course of educational inquiry today. This is a central purpose of a series of sessions at this conference, culminating in Session 12.01 chaired by Joseph Schwab (1979).

The Ideal and the Mundane

The lofty ideals, i.e., the Platonic search for wisdom, that I advocate for curriculum scholarship in the foregoing, is indeed serious. It makes a claim that is similar to Broudy's in his recent critique of what professors of education profess (1979). He invoked Plato's "divided line" allegory (The republic, Book VI), and argued that educational scholars seldom move beyond levels "two" and "three", the levels of facts and hypothetical entities or models. It is, in fact, thought presumptuous for them to even claim investigations into level "four", the realm of intuition with the forms. Rarely, if ever, do curricularists, other educators, and other scholars as well, directly admit that they engage in pursuit of wisdom, to usurp the title of Abraham Kaplan's (1977) recent book. The job of the curriculum professoriat cannot stop short of this kind of investigation. After all, one must go far to find an endeavor as worthy of seriousness as the

development of itineraries by which children and youth move toward adult social life.

The import of this endeavor is indeed laudable, indeed admirable, and is I believe, a subtle germ of inspiration that lingers in those who are among the curriculum professoriat. It is perhaps this germ of inspiration that enables curriculum professors to tolerate certain debilitating characteristics of their occupation. These characteristics, unmentioned thus far in this paper, must be placed in juxtaposition with our loftiest ideals. Curriculum professors are expected to be first class teachers, consultants, researchers, and authors. For this work they are underpaid, overworked, expected to compete in productivity with colleagues in other disciplines, have that productivity defined by these colleagues as publication rather than direct service to the journey of children and youth, and have their work and ability in the academic community defined as less than adequate. Moreover, their would-be clients in schools think of curriculum as dry and boring. With this kind of support from colleagues and clients the potential for public support is dire indeed. We scarcely need reminders about the public criticism that riddles the entire educational establishment from the nursery to the scholar. Yet, there is no small hiatus between the ideal that motivates the curriculum professoriat and evidence for the work attributed to it by colleagues, clients, and the public. A major problem, then, is to generate increased regard to the work of the curriculum professoriat. An important step can be made by applying curriculum inquiry to the wider domain from which it has grown, i.e., to a holistic concern for the journey from birth to adulthood. Hopefully, this concern which became professorial through the thrust of universal schooling was only

captivated and not expurgated by its necessary preoccupation with schooling. Today, I suggest that broader applications of curriculum inquiry are needed in addition to these. Two examples follow. One I refer to as "outside curricula" and the other as a "theory within." Since I treat each at length in other papers³ I will be very brief here.

Outside Curricula

Curriculum books almost invariably attest to the near universal emphasis on schooling by the curriculum professoriat. Extricated from its social and cultural context, curriculum becomes addressed as only one of many forces in the journey that enables children to understand, function in, and contribute to adult life. That one force is schooling. Most any teacher will readily admit that forces beyond the control of schooling and outside of its purview have monumental influence on the child's view of the world. Quite obviously, homes, peer groups, formal youth organizations, jobs, and media profoundly influence children and youth. Compared to the cumulative effect of these outside curricula, school curriculum itself is dwarfed. It is doubtful that curriculum can be studied meaningfully today apart from full attention to the interdependent character of life's curricula. Each curriculum influences conceptions of self and others, hopes, ambitions, fears, insights, values, roles, rules, power hierarchies, etc. The curriculum professoriat has accumulated a repertoire of analytic categories for investigation of school curriculum. I suggest that these or similar categories can be used to map features of the interactive journey of children and youth through the outside curriculum of media, peer groups, jobs, organizations, and homes, i.e., the outside curricula.

The Theory Within

The outside curricula and school shape a theory within children and youth. It is a theory that they are, a living theory that guides their functioning, that embodies their information and misinformation about the world, how it works, and how to relate to it. Without knowledge of student knowledge (Schubert, 1978), how can curriculum developers defensibly determine what is needed for subsequent stages of the journey of children and youth toward adulthood? It is such knowledge of the journey that shapes human character and builds human ideals that must be addressed, in my estimation, if the spark that ignited perennial curriculum interest is to be kept alive. It was a similar spark that Jaeger sought to find as he described paideia, "the shaping of Greek character" (p. ix). He described the unique purpose of his classic work as follows:

Although many scholars have undertaken to describe the development of the state, the society, the literature, and religion, and the philosophy of the Greeks, no one seems to have attempted to explain the interaction between the historical process by which their character was formed and the intellectual process by which they constructed their ideal of human personality. (Jaeger, 1945, p. ix).

Discovery of paideia in every culture is, I suggest, important to any scholarly domain, foreign to none, and essential to the work of the curriculum professoriat.

Notes

1. This has been the subject of two AERA presentations, i.e.: "The literature of curriculum development: Toward centralization and analysis" (San Francisco, 1976), and "The literature of curriculum development: Toward centralization and analysis -- Phase II" (New York, 1977). A version of the bibliography was distributed to members of the AERA SIG on the creation and utilization of Curriculum Development under the title, A chronology of curriculum literature, (1977), 58 pp.
2. The paper is: "Toward a genealogy of curriculum scholars," by George J. Posner and William H. Schubert, presented to the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, April 8-12, 1979. The presentation to the Society for the Study of Curriculum History is, at this writing, planned as an informal working session on the genealogy, April 8, 1979.
3. Manuscripts entitled "Outside curricula: Missing links in curriculum study," and "The theory within: An investigation into the problem of teaching theory to teachers," have recently been completed. They are about to be submitted for publication.

Bibliography

- Bobbitt, F. What the schools teach and might teach. Cleveland: The Survey Committee of the Cleveland Foundation, 1915.
- Bobbitt, F. The curriculum. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1918.
- Bobbitt, F. Curriculum making in Los Angeles. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1922.
- Bobbitt, F. How to make a curriculum. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1924.
- Bobbitt, F., et al. Curriculum investigations. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1926.
- Bode, B.H. Modern educational theories. New York: Macmillan, 1927.
- Bonser, F. G. The elementary school curriculum. New York: Macmillan, 1920.
- Briggs, T. H. Curriculum problems. New York: Macmillan, 1926.
- Broudy, H. S. What do professors of education profess? The DeGarmo Lecture of the Society of Professors of Education. Chicago: Forthcoming by the Society, February 28, 1978.
- Burton, W. H. The guidance of learning activities. New York: D. Appleton-Century, 1944.
- Caswell, H.L. and Campbell, D. S. Curriculum development. New York: American Book Company, 1935.
- Caswell, H.L. and Campbell, D. S. (Editors). Readings in curriculum development. New York: American Book Company, 1937.
- Charters, W. W. Curriculum construction. New York: Macmillan, 1923.

- Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education. Cardinal principles of secondary education. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1918.
- Counts, G.S. The senior high school curriculum. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1926.
- Dewey, J. The educational situation. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1900.
- Dewey, J. The child and the curriculum. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1902.
- Dewey, J. Interest and effort in education. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1913.
- Dewey, J. Democracy and education. New York: Macmillan, 1916.
- Dewey, J. The way out of educational confusion. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1931.
- Edwards, P. (Ed.) The encyclopedia of philosophy. (four volumes). New York: Macmillan, 1967.
- Fodor, J. The language of thought. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1975.
- Gwynn, J. M. Curriculum principles and social trends. New York: Macmillan, 1943.
- Harap, H. The techniques of curriculum making. New York: Macmillan, 1928.
- Herrick, V. E. and Tyler, R. W. (Editors). Toward improved curriculum theory. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1950.

- Hopkins, L.T. Curriculum principles and procedures. New York: Benjamin H. Sanborn, 1929.
- Hopkins, L.T. Curriculum making: General. Review of Educational Research, January, 1931, 1 (1) pp. 5-8.
- Jaeger, W. Paideia: The ideals of Greek culture (Volume 1). New York: Oxford University Press, 1976 reprint of 1945.
- Kaplan, A. In pursuit of wisdom. London: Glencoe Press, 1977.
- Kilpatrick, W.H. Foundations of method. New York: Macmillan, 1926.
- Kilpatrick, W.H. The project method. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1918.
- Koos, L.V. The junior high school. New York: Harcourt, Brace, and World, 1920.
- Krug, E.A. Curriculum planning. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1950.
- Lee, J.M. and Lee, O.M. The child and his curriculum (Second Edition). New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1950.
- Leonard, J.P. Developing the secondary school curriculum. New York: Rinehart and Company, 1946.
- Lide, E.S. Procedures in curriculum making. (National Survey of Secondary Education). Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1932.
- McMurry, C.A. Course of study in the eight grades (Volume I and II). New York: Macmillan, 1906.
- McMurry, C.A. How to organize the curriculum. New York: MacMillan, 1923.
- Meriam, J.L. Child life and the curriculum. Yonkers, New York: World Books, 1920.
- Monroe, W.S. Making a course of study. Urbana: University of Illinois, 1925.

- Norton, J.K. and Norton, M.A. Foundations of curriculum building.
Boston: Ginn, 1936.
- Ohles, J. F. (Ed.) Biographical dictionary of American educators.
(Three volumes). Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1978.
- Pinar, W. (Ed.) Curriculum theorizing: The reconceptualists. Berkeley:
McCutchan, 1975.
- Pinar, W. Notes on the curriculum field. Educational Researcher.
September, 1978 7 (8), p. 5-12.
- Pritzkau, P.T. Dynamics of curriculum improvement. Englewood Cliffs,
New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1959.
- Ragan, W.B. Modern elementary curriculum. New York: Holt, Rinehart and
Winston, 1953.
- Rugg, H.O. (Ed.) The foundations of curriculum making (Twenty-sixth
Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Volume
11). Bloomington, Illinois: Public School Publishing Company,
1927 .
- Rugg, H.O. and Shumacker, A. The child-centered school. Yonkers, New
York: World Book, 1928.
- Saylor, J. G. and Alexander, W. Curriculum planning for better teaching
and learning. New York: Holt Rinehart and Winston, 1954.
- Schubert, W. H. Educational knowledge about student knowledge. Insights.
December, 1978, 15 (2), pp. 3-4.
- Schubert, W.H. A heritage of curriculum literature. (Book draft is
complete and in revision stages), 1979.
- Schwab, W.J. The practical: A language for curriculum. Washington,
D.C.: National Education Association, 1979.

Schwab, J.J. Values imposed by the behavioral and social disciplines:

Implications for education research and development policy.

Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association.

San Francisco, April, 1979. (This is Session 12.01 organized by

Hendrik Gideonse and Robert Koff. It culminates six sessions:

1.24, 4.14, 6.11, 8.17, 9.106, 11.30).

Sequel, M.L. The curriculum field: Its formative years. New York:

Teachers College, Columbia University Press, 1966.

Smith, B.O., Stanley, W.O., and Shores, J.H. Fundamentals of curriculum

development. Yonkers-on-the Hudson, New York: World Book Company,

1950.

Snedden, D.S. Sociological determination of objectives in education,

Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1921.

Snedden, D.S. Foundations of curricula: Sociological analysis. New York:

Teachers College, Columbia University, 1927.

Spears, H. The emerging high school curriculum and its direction. New

York: American Book Company, 1940.

Stratemeyer, F.B., et al. Developing a curriculum for modern living.

New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia

University, 1947.

Taba, H. Curriculum development: Theory and practice. New York:

Harcourt, Brace and World, 1962.

Tyler, R. Basic principles of curriculum and instruction. Chicago:

University of Chicago Press, 1949.

Williams, L.A. The making of high-school curricula. New York:

1928.